

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference T2953-PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/BE2004/000105	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 19 July 2004 (19.07.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 17 July 2003 (17.07.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant THROMB-X NV		

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 9 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.
3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I Basis of the report
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis.2).

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Date of issuance of this report 23 January 2006 (23.01.2006)
Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Authorized officer Simin Baharlou Telephone No. +41 22 338 71 30

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

RECD 07 JAN 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

27/1

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/BE2004/000105

International filing date (day/month/year)
19.07.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
17.07.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
A61K38/17, A61P7/06

Applicant
THROMB-X NV

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Fayos, C

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2180



Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - a sequence listing
 - table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - in written format
 - in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - contained in the international application as filed.
 - filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/BE2004/000105

Box No. II Priority

1. The following document has not been furnished:

- copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
 translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
4. Additional observations, if necessary:

see separate sheet

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- the entire international application,
 claims Nos. 13-16 and 19-20 (industrial applicability)

because:

- the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 13-16 and 19-20 (industrial applicability) relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):
see separate sheet
- the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*);
- the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
- no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.
- the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form has not been furnished

does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form has not been furnished

does not comply with the standard

the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/BE2004/000105

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	-
	No: Claims	1-20
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	-
	No: Claims	1-20
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-12, 17-18; 13-16 and 19-20 see separate sheet.
	No: Claims	-

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VI Certain documents cited

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.10)

and / or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.9)

see form 210

Re Item II

Priority

- 1- The current assessment is based on the assumption that all claims enjoy priority rights from the filing date of the priority document. If the later turns out that is not correct, the document D3 cited in the international search report could become relevant.

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

- 2- Claims 13-16, 19-20 relate to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- 3- Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: GB-A-2 378 899 (THROMB X N V) 26 February 2003 (2003-02-26)
D2: WO 96/28548 A (CHEN JIAN ; GENENTECH INC (US); GODOWSKI PAUL J (US); LI RONGHAO (US);) 19 September 1996 (1996-09-19)
D3: ANGELILLO-SCHERRER ANNE ET AL: "Critical amplification by Gas6 of the Epo-dependent erythropoietic response to anemia: Novel opportunities for anemia treatment." BLOOD, vol. 102, no. 11, 16 November 2003 (2003-11-16), page 351a, XP009041079 & 45TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF HEMATOLOGY; SAN DIEGO, CA, USA; DECEMBER 06-09, 2003 ISSN: 0006-4971
D4: ANGELILLO-SCHERRER ANNE ET AL: "Blunted Response to Erythropoietic Stress in Gas6 Deficient Mice Due to a Combination of Reduced Erythropoiesis and Decreased Erythroblast Survival." BLOOD, vol. 100, no. 11, 16 November 2002 (2002-11-16), page Abstract No. 2588, XP009041078 & 44TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF HEMATOLOGY; PHILADELPHIA, PA, USA; DECEMBER 06-10, 2002 ISSN: 0006-4971

- 3.1- The relevant passages are those indicated in the search report, unless otherwise specified.

NOVELTY - Art. 33 (1) and (2) PCT

4- Claims 1-20 lack novelty:

- 4.1- D1 discloses use of Gas6 alone or in combination with erythropoietin for the treatment or prevention of anemia. D1 is novelty destroying for the subject matter of claims 1-20.
- 4.2- D2 mentions the use of Gas6 for treating anemia, alone or in combination with erythropoietin. D2 is also considered to be novelty destroying for the subject matter of claims 1-20.

INVENTIVE STEP - Art. 33 (1) and (3) PCT

- 5- Should novelty be established, which does not appear to be the case (see above), then the subject matter of claims 1-20 would still lack inventive step at least in view of D1.

INDUSTRIAL APPLICABILITY - Art. 33 (1) and (4) PCT

- 6- For the assessment of the present claims 13-16, 19-20 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.
- 7- When / if carrying out amendments, and in order to facilitate the examination of the conformity of the amended application with the requirements of Article 34(2)(b) PCT, the applicant is requested to clearly identify the amendments carried out, no matter whether they concern amendments by addition, replacement or deletion, and to indicate precisely the passages of the application as filed on which these amendments are based (also rule 66.8 (a) PCT).

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/BE2004/000105

Only amendments with a clearly identified basis on the application as originally filed will be taken into account for the international preliminary examination report.